

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/792,092	Applicant(s) PAILA ET AL.	
	Examiner KENAN CEHIC	Art Unit 2473	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KENAN CEHIC. (3) ____.

(2) Douglas Goldhush. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 08 March 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
 ☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☒112 ☐102 ☒103 ☐Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1,13 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Thompson of record, Ollikainen et al (US 2002/0035730) .

Substance of Interview
 (For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The examiner took the stance that Thompson still disclosed the amended claim limitations of claim 1, 13, and 16. Specifically, it is believed that Thompson discloses where the multicast tree ends at a edge device The examiner suggested to add the following limitations to overcome the prior art: " wherein only unidirectional downlink communication and the cell level multicast controller originates a message to join the second multicast tree, if the join message is received, then transmitting the control messages...". The prior art does not either by anticipation or combination disclose those teachings in combination with the rest of the claim language. The applicant agreed to make those amendments. Further, it was discussed that claim 16 invokes 112 6th paragraph, where the specification does not make it clear which sepcific, if any, structures are associated with each of the transmission means and control means. Further even if one could map a communication / control means to a specific node disclosed in the specification, there is at least insufficient disclosure of a structure. The applicant agreed to cancel claim 16 .

Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment